

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		NG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Claudia Conti	88265-412	CONFIRMATION NO. 2052	
09/785,398	02/20/2001					
28765	7590	06/18/2003				
WINSTON &			EXAMINER			
PATENT DEPARTMENT 1400 L STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3502				TRAN LIE	TRAN LIEN, THUY	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1761			
				DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/785,398**

Applicant(s)

Conti et al.

Examiner

Lien Tran

Art Unit 1761



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period f	or Reply	
	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET	TO EXPIRE3 MONTH(S) FROM
	AAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In I	no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
mailing	date of this communication. eriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within th	
- If NO p	eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a	nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
	to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause th ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of th	
earned Status	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	
	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 25, 2	
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This action	on is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under $\it Ex~pai$	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is the Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposit	ion of Claims	
4) 🗶	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗀	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	tion Papers	•
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	-
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	o this Office action.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13)└─	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) L	J All ♭)□ Some* c)□ None of:	
,	1. Certified copies of the priority documents hav	e been received.
	2. U Certified copies of the priority documents hav	
	application from the International Burea	
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	·
. —	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
a) ∟ 15) □		
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 30 0.3.C. 33 120 dHU/ULTZT.
Attachmo 1) No	ent(s) tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
	tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 09/785398 Page 2

Art Unit: 1761

1. Claims 1,9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1,9 and 14, a range of "more than 40 seconds to at least 70" is confusing because applicant essentially claims two ranges within the same claim. The ranges are more than 40-70 and 70 and beyond; this is range within a range. It is not clear what is intended.

2. Claims 1,4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biggs et al in view of Negro (4629628).

Biggs et al disclose a wafer comprising flour, sucrose, invert sugar, fat, salt and lecithin. The wafer contain a food core selected form the group consisting of ice cream, fish, meat, vegetable, fruit, nuts, chocolate pieces and the like. The wafer may be coated with a barrier coating such as a fat or fat based coating. (See column 2)

Biggs et al do not disclose adding water, water in the amount claimed, sugar in the amount claimed, the flour is wheat flour and the flexible time at ambient temperature.

Negro disclose formulations for wafer. The reference teaches that wheat flour is the most suitable for wafer and water is added to make the wafer batter. (See column 1)

While Biggs et al do not disclose the flour is wheat flour, it would have bee obvious to use wheat flour because it is well known in the art that whenever the term flour is used, it means wheat flour. However, even if Biggs et al do not intend for the flour to be wheat flour, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use wheat flour because

Application/Control Number: 09/785398 Page 3

Art Unit: 1761

Negro. It would also have been obvious to add water to the Biggs et al composition to make a batter. It is well known that water or some other type of fluid is needed in order to make a batter and wafer is made from batter. This is well known in the art and also taught by Negro. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add water in order to make a batter to be used in making the wafer. The amount of water used depends on the type of batter desired. If a thin batter is intended, it would have been obvious to use more water than a thicker batter. One skilled in the art can determine the appropriate amount of water through routine experimentation taking into consideration of the type of batter and the texture desired from such batter. As to the flexibility, the flexibility is obtained by using sucrose in combination with a reducing sugar. Claim 1 set forth two alternatives to obtain a wafer having the claimed flexibility. Since the Biggs et al wafer contains sucrose and reducing sugar, it obvious that the wafer will have the same flexibility.

- 3. Claims 2-3,9-20 are free of prior art because there is no disclosure or suggestion to add cereal grits to the wafer disclosed by Biggs et al and there is no disclosure or suggestion to change the ratio of sucrose:reducing sugar to the amount as claimed.
- 4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lien Tran whose telephone number is 703-308-1868. The examiner can

Application/Control Number: 09/785398

Page 4

Art Unit: 1761

normally be reached on Wed-Fri. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9310.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

June 13, 2003

LIEN TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER